

REMARKS

In the response to amendment and arguments in the office action dated November 19, 2007, the Examiner argued the claim language “wherein the molecular structures are biomolecules and the molecular combing comprises attachment of the biomolecules to the surface and alignment of the attached biomolecules,” when read broadly was disclosed by Kley and Kondo. In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 24 to recite “wherein the molecular structures are biomolecules and the molecular combing comprises attachment of the biomolecules to the surface and alignment of the attached biomolecules *by drawing the biomolecule through a moving meniscus*.” Support for this feature can be found in paragraph [0046] of the specification.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-13, 24-26, and 28-30 were rejected over the combination of Kley (U.S. Pat. 6,396,054) and Kondo (U.S. Pub 2004/0076996). Amended independent claims 1 and 24 to recite “wherein the molecular structures are biomolecules and the molecular combing comprises attachment of the biomolecules to the surface and alignment of the attached biomolecules *by drawing the biomolecule through a moving meniscus*.” This feature is neither taught nor suggested by either Kley or Kondo. Kondo merely teaches “introducing a reaction eluent (L) containing a predetermined DNA into a stationary-phase DNA probe (53) having a predetermined temperature and arranged in series or in parallel and separating a DNA complementary to the stationary-phase DNA probe (53).” See abstract and paragraphs [0026], and [0042]. Further, the Examiner has already admitted that Kley fails to disclose “a biomolecule and aligning a biomolecule in a parallel manner on a surface.” See page 4, last paragraph of the Action. Thus, the combination of Kley and Kondo, assuming it is proper to combine the references, does not disclose molecular combing as claimed. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

